

**COLE, SCHOTZ, MEISEL,
FORMAN & LEONARD, P.A.**

A Professional Corporation

Court Plaza North

25 Main Street

P.O. Box 800

Hackensack, New Jersey 07602-0800

Michael D. Sirota, Esq.

Warren A. Usatine, Esq.

Ilana Volkov, Esq.

Ryan T. Jareck, Esq.

(201) 489-3000

(201) 489-1536 Facsimile

Counsel for the Official Committee
of Unsecured Creditors

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
HONORABLE GLORIA M. BURNS
CASE NO. 14-22654 (GMB)

In re:

REVEL AC, INC., *et al.*,¹

Debtors-in-Possession.

Chapter 11
(Jointly Administered)

HEARING DATE AND TIME:
August 18, 2014, at 11:30 a.m.

**JOINDER OF THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS TO THE
DEBTORS' (I) OBJECTION TO MOTION OF RAVEL HOTEL LLC FOR RELIEF
FROM THE STAY UNDER SECTION 362 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE AND
(II) CROSS-MOTION TO EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY TO LICENSOR**

¹ The Debtors in these Chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal identification number are: Revel AC, Inc. (3856), Revel AC, LLC (4456), Revel Atlantic City, LLC (9513), Revel Entertainment Group, LLC (2321), NB Acquisition, LLC (9387) and SI LLC (3856).

The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the “**Committee**”) of Revel AC, Inc. and its affiliated debtors and debtors-in-possession (the “**Debtors**”) hereby joins (the “**Joinder**”) in the response and objection (the “**Objection**”) of the Debtors to the *Motion of Ravel Hotel LLC for Entry of an order Granting Relief From the Automatic Stay in the Bankruptcy Case of Revel Entertainment Group, LLC in Connection With the Trademark Litigation* (the “**Motion**”). After reviewing the Motion and the Objection and consulting with the Debtors and their counsel, the Committee hereby joins in and adopts the Debtors’ arguments contained in the Objection and files this Joinder in support of the Objection. Specifically, the Committee agrees with and joins in the Debtors’ cogent arguments that authorizing the meritless Trademark Litigation² to proceed at this time would substantially jeopardize the Debtors’ sale process and generate significant and unnecessary administrative expenses to the detriment of the Debtors’ estates. To the contrary, the Claimant’s interests are adequately protected and will suffer little, if any, prejudice from the continuation of the automatic stay.

² All capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meanings ascribed to them in the Objection.

For the reasons more extensively set forth in the Objection, the Committee respectfully requests that the Court deny the Motion and grant the Debtors and their estates such other relief as the Court deems just and appropriate under the circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

COLE, SCHOTZ, MEISEL,
FORMAN & LEONARD, P.A.
Counsel for the Official Committee
of Unsecured Creditors

By: /s/ Michael D. Sirota
Michael D. Sirota
Warren A. Usatine
Ilana Volkov
Ryan T. Jareck

DATED: August 5, 2014